| Case 8:10-cv-01899-WQH-AJB Document 102 Filed 02/03/11 PageID.19 | | | | PageID.1966 | Page 1 of 7 |
|--|---|-----------------|--------|---------------|-------------|
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | |
| 9 | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | JUNE FULLECIDO-RE REYNO, Sui Juris; JFW | | E CAS | E NO.10cv1899 | WQH (AJB) |
| 12 | RESIDENTIAL CARE, | | ORD | ER | |
| 13 | | Claimant | S, | | |
| 14 | DAVID WYNN-MILLE Plenipotentiary Judge, | ER, | | | |
| 15 | | Co-Claiman | nt | | |
| 16 | vs. SAND CANYON CORI | PORATION, as | | | |
| 17 | successor to Option One Corporation and Premier | Mortgage Capita | al | | |
| 18 | Services, Inc.; FANNIE CORPORATION, TS-N | MAE | | | |
| 19 | 79964-JB, #19089622; N ELECTRONIC REGIST | | | | |
| 20 | SYSTEMS, INC.; MERS MICHAEL BURNETT, | ESQ & | | | |
| 21 22 | MATTHEWS, LLP; MI BURNETT, ESQ; DAV | ID OWEN; RICH | ζ | | |
| 23 | HOFFMAN; CLAUDIA RONALD D. ROUP, ES | SQ; BRAD M. | | | |
| 24 | SIMON, ESQ; CYNTHI G. GEOFFREY BARRY | 7, ESQ; KIP LEĒ | ; ; | | |
| 25 | MATTHEW WINTERS WAGNER; CINDIE WI | LLIS; MARK | | | |
| 26 | KEIPER; JOSEPH MAS GERALDINE VALDEZ | Z, ESQ; W.L. | | | |
| 27 | ROSS; LARRY LITTO STUMPF; JOSEPH CAI | | Λ; | | |
| 28 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |

- 1 -

THOMAS G. ROCK; PATRICK 1 MCCLAIN; JAMES E. ROHR; OPTION ONE MORTGAGE; CAPITAL 2 MORTGAGE, C2935541; CT 3 CORPORATION SYSTEMS: RESIDENTIAL FUNDING REAL ESTATE HOLDINGS, LLC; QUALITY 4 LOAN SERVICE CORPORATION, 5 C1613350; KEVIN R. MCCARTHY ESQ; GRAND BANK, N.A.; CARNEGIE MORTGAGE, LLC; ORANGE COAST LINE, C0703360; MICHAEL M. 6 7 KALUGER, JR ESQ; STEVE FERNANDO: OPTION ONE 8 MORTGAGE CAPITAL CORPORATION, C2935541; 9 MCCALLA RAYMER LAW GROUP. LLC; JEFFREY M. SCHWARTZ, ESÓ. 10 SB 25916; H&R BLOCK; ARGENT MORTGAGE COMPANY, LLC; TOWN 11 AND COUNTRY TITLE SERVICES, INC.; UNIGROUP, INC.; UNITED VAN 12 LINES, (Registered Agent: Jan Roby Alonzo); SULLIVAN MOVING & 13 STORAGE, 14 Vassalees.

HAYES, Judge:

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The matters before the Court are the Motion to Dismiss filed by Wells Fargo Bank, John Stumpf, and Wells Fargo Home Mortgage Servicing ("Wells Fargo") (ECF No. 24), the Motion to Dismiss filed by Ronald D. Roup, Esq., Brad M. Simon, Esq., and Larry Litton (ECF No. 44), the Motion to Dismiss filed by Kevin R. McCarthy, David Owen, and Quality Loan Service Corporation (ECF No. 45), the Motion to Dismiss filed by Sand Canyon Corporation (as Successor to Option One Mortgage Capital Corporation and Premier Trust Deed Services, Inc.), H&R Block Corporation, and Geraldine A. Valdez (ECF No. 47), the Motion to Dismiss filed by Argent Mortgage Company, LLC, and Town and Country Title Services, Inc. (ECF No. 49), the Motion to Dismiss filed by Orange Coast Title Company, Michael M. Kaluger, Jr., Esq., and Steve Fernando (ECF No. 50), the Motion to Dismiss filed by Fannie Mae Corporation, TS-Number CA-07-79964-JB, #19089622 (ECF Nos. 40, 51), the

Motion to Dismiss filed by Grand Banks, N.A., and Carnegie Mortgage, LLC (ECF No. 53), the Motion to Dismiss filed by W.L. Ross (ECF No. 57), the Motion to Dismiss filed by 3 Unigroup Inc., United Van Lines (registered agent: Jan Roby Alonzo), Mark Keiper, and Sullivan Moving & Storage (ECF No. 59), the Motion for Evidentiary Hearing filed by David 4 5 Wynn-Miller (ECF No. 75), the Motion to Dismiss filed by Michael W. Burnett & Mathews, 6 LLP, Michael W. Burnett, Joseph Massaro, and Thomas G. Rock (ECF No. 76), the Motion 7 to Dismiss filed by Jeffrey M. Schwartz, Esq., SBN 25916 (ECF No. 77), the Motion for the 8 Application for the Order Shortening Time filed by David Wynn-Miller, June Fullecido-9 Reyno, and Freddie Reyno (ECF No. 89), the Motion for Evidentiary Hearing filed by David 10 Wynn-Miller (ECF No. 92), the Motion to Dismiss filed by Residential Funding Company, 11 LLC, and Residential Funding Real Estate Holdings Company, LLC (ECF No. 94), and the 12 Motion to Dismiss filed by James E. Rohr, National-City-Bank-PNC-Financial-Services-13 Group, Inc. (ECF No. 100).

BACKGROUND

On September 13, 2010, Plaintiffs June Fullecido-Reyno, Freddie Reyno, and David Wynn-Miller¹ initiated this action by filing the Complaint. (ECF No. 1). The Complaint is captioned as follows:

For Writ of an Amicus Curiae; for the Correct Sentence Structure Communication Syntax Language Oath; for the Claimant's-Knowledge of an unauthorized-use of tradename; for the Claimants'-Knowledge is with the Damage-Claim of the Counterfeit-Forgery-Mail-Fraud; Title-~18: C.-S.-S.-C.-S.-L.~1342. with the Knowledge; Title 42-~U.-S.-C.-S.~1986, Title-~18: C.-S.-C.-S.-~1001 as a Tort-Damage with the Penalty Title 15-~: C.-S.-C.-~Chapter~2-~b-~Section-~78-~ff; and: California-Civil-Code-~1549 by the Vassalees' Fraudulent-Modification Documents

(ECF No. 1 at 1-2 (emphasis omitted)). The Complaint begins as follows: "In The Contract-

Court construe as defendants.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

¹ The Complaint is asserted by "June-Fullecido: Reyno, Freddie: Reyno, Sui Juris; JFW Adult Residential Care Claimants: Plenipotentiary: Judge: David-Wynn: Miller Co-Claimant." (ECF No. 1 at 1). The Court construes the Complaint as having been brought by Plaintiffs June Fullecido-Reyno, Freddie Reyno, and David Wynn-Miller. The Court will not construe JFW Adult Resident Care as a plaintiff because, "[o]nly natural persons representing their

June Fullecido-Reyno, Freddie Reyno, and David Wynn-Miller. The Court will not construe JFW Adult Resident Care as a plaintiff because, "[o]nly natural persons representing their individual interests in propria persona may appear in court without representation by an attorney...." CivLR 83.3(k). To date, there has been no appearance in this case by any attorney for JFW Adult Resident Care. The Complaints also lists several "vassalees" which the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

States-Postal-Service-Di-Strict-Court of this Contract-Territory ith this Writ of an Amicus-Curiae." *Id.* at 2. (emphasis in original). The Complaint alleges, "For the Correct-Sentence-Structure-Communication-Syntax-Language-Oath of the Fiduciary-Officer is with the claim of the Judge, Attorneys, Sheriffs, City and: County Officers with this Contract-Vessel-Territory." *Id.* at 4 (emphasis in original)). Plaintiffs have attached exhibits to the Complaint including several deeds of trust, a balloon rider, an adjustable rate rider, several legal descriptions of property, an assignment of deed of trust, a notice of default and election to sell under deed of trust, a grant deed, a corporation assignment of deed of trust, a substitution of trustee, an affidavit of mailing for substitution of trustee by code, a notice of trustee's sale, a notice of intent to preserve interest, an order expunging notice of intent to preserve interest, a trustee's deed upon sale, an order on motion for relief from the automatic stay, a quitclaim deed, an assignment of deed of trust, a certification pursuant to government code section 27361.7, a corporation grant deed, a certificate of acceptance, a grant deed, a notice of pendency of action (lis pendens), a withdrawal of notice of pendency of action (lis pendens), and a grant deed. Each of these exhibits contain a chart titled, ":Syntax-word-key-meaning:" which states: "1=Adverb, 2=Verb, 3=Adjective, 4=Pronoun, 8=Past-time, 9=Future-time, 0=Conjunction, NC=No-Contract." Each exhibit is marked with the numbers from the ":Syntax-word-key-meaning."

DISCUSSION

The Defendants generally seek dismissal on the grounds that the Complaint fails to state claim upon which relief can be granted and due to lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Defendants alternatively seek a more definite statement.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) permits dismissal for "failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted." Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) provides: "A pleading that states a claim for relief must contain ... a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) is appropriate where the complaint lacks a cognizable legal theory or sufficient facts to support a cognizable legal theory. *See Balistreri v. Pacifica Police*

Dep't, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

To sufficiently state a claim to relief and survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, a complaint "does not need detailed factual allegations" but the "[f]actual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). "[A] plaintiff's obligation to provide the 'grounds' of his 'entitle[ment] to relief' requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do." *Id.* (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2)). When considering a motion to dismiss, a court must accept as true all "well-pleaded factual allegations." Ashcroft v. Iqbal, --- U.S. ---, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1950 (2009). However, a court is not "required to accept as true allegations that are merely conclusory, unwarranted deductions of fact, or unreasonable inferences." Sprewell v. Golden State Warriors, 266 F.3d 979, 988 (9th Cir. 2001); see, e.g., Doe I v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 572 F.3d 677, 683 (9th Cir. 2009) ("Plaintiffs' general statement that Wal-Mart exercised control over their day-to-day employment is a conclusion, not a factual allegation stated with any specificity. We need not accept Plaintiffs' unwarranted conclusion in reviewing a motion to dismiss."). "In sum, for a complaint to survive a motion to dismiss, the non-conclusory factual content, and reasonable inferences from that content, must be plausibly suggestive of a claim entitling the plaintiff to relief." Moss v. U.S. Secret Serv., 572 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir. 2009) (quotations omitted).

The Complaint is incomprehensible and fails to assert "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Dismissal is appropriate in this case because complaint lacks a cognizable legal theory or sufficient facts to support a cognizable legal theory. *See Balistreri*, 901 F.2d at 699. Accordingly, the Motions to Dismiss filed by Wells Fargo Bank, John Stumpf, Wells Fargo Home Mortgage Servicing, Ronald D. Roup, Esq., Brad M. Simon, Esq., Larry Litton, Kevin R. McCarthy, David Owen, Quality Loan Service Corporation, Sand Canyon Corporation (as Successor to Option One Mortgage Capital Corporation and Premier Trust Deed Services, Inc.), H&R Block Corporation, Geraldine A. Valdez, Argent Mortgage Company, LLC and Town and Country Title Services, Inc., Orange Coast Title Company, Michael M. Kaluger, Jr., Esq., and Steve

Fernando, Fannie Mae Corporation, TS-Number CA-07-79964-JB, #19089622, Grand Banks, N.A., Carnegie Mortgage, LLC, W.L. Ross, Unigroup Inc., United Van Lines (registered agent: Jan Roby Alonzo), Mark Keiper, Sullivan Moving & Storage, Michael W. Burnett & Mathews, LLP, Michael W. Burnett, Joseph Massaro, Thomas G. Rock, Jeffrey M. Schwartz, Esq., SBN 25916, Residential Funding Company, LLC, Residential Funding Real Estate Holdings Company, LLC, James E. Rohr, and National-City-Bank-PNC-Financial-Services-Group, Inc. are **GRANTED**. This Court concludes that the Complaint is dismissed as to all Defendants based on the finding that the Complaint fails to allege a cognizable legal theory or sufficient facts to support a cognizable legal theory.

Plaintiffs have also filed a "Motion for Evidentiary Hearing and Hearing for Oral Argument on the Order Shortening Time for the :Order: Now-Time-Fault-Judgment:" (ECF No. 75), a Motion "For the Application For the Order Shortening Time For the Notice of -the Hearing-" (ECF No. 89), and a "Motion for Evidentiary Hearing and Hearing For Oral Argument" (ECF No. 92). (emphasis omitted). To the extent these Motions seek oral argument, the Court finds that the Motions are suitable for decision on the papers pursuant to CivLR 7.1(d)(1). To the extent these Motions seek entry of default judgment, Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b)(2) provides that the Court may grant a default judgment after default has been entered by the Clerk of the Court. The Clerk of Court has not entered default in this case. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' Motions are **DENIED**.

CONCLUSION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

(1) The Motions to Dismiss filed by Wells Fargo Bank, John Stumpf, and Wells Fargo Home Mortgage Servicing (ECF No. 24), Ronald D. Roup, Esq., Brad M. Simon, Esq., and Larry Litton (ECF No. 44), Kevin R. McCarthy, David Owen, and Quality Loan Service Corporation (ECF No. 45), Sand Canyon Corporation (as Successor to Option One Mortgage Capital Corporation and Premier Trust Deed Services, Inc.), H&R Block Corporation, and Geraldine A. Valdez (ECF No. 47), Argent Mortgage Company, LLC and Town and Country Title

Services, Inc. (ECF No. 49), Orange Coast Title Company, Michael M. Kaluger, Jr., Esq., and Steve Fernando (ECF No. 50), Fannie Mae Corporation, TS-Number CA-07-79964-JB, #19089622 (ECF Nos. 40, 51), Grand Banks, N.A., and Carnegie Mortgage, LLC (ECF No. 53), W.L. Ross (ECF No. 57), Unigroup Inc., United Van Lines (registered agent: Jan Roby Alonzo), Mark Keiper and Sullivan Moving & Storage (ECF No. 59), Michael W. Burnett & Mathews, LLP, Michael W. Burnett, Joseph Massaro, and Thomas G. Rock (ECF No. 76), Jeffrey M. Schwartz, Esq., SBN 25916 (ECF No. 77), Residential Funding Company, LLC and Residential Funding Real Estate Holdings Company, LLC (ECF No. 94), and James E. Rohr, National-City-Bank-PNC-Financial-Services-Group, Inc. (ECF No. 100) are **GRANTED**. Plaintiffs' Complaint is dismissed. Plaintiffs may file a motion for leave to file an amended complaint within thirty days from the date of this Order. Plaintiffs must obtain a hearing date pursuant to the Local Rules of Civil Procedure before filing any motion. In the event no motion is filed, the Court will close the case.

(2) Plaintiffs' Motion for Evidentiary Hearing (ECF No. 75), Motion for the Application for the Order Shortening Time (ECF No. 89), and Motion for Evidentiary Hearing (ECF No. 92) are **DENIED**.

DATED: February 3, 2011

WILLIAM Q. HAYES
United States District Judge